ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. **Project title: 549 South San Fernando Boulevard (Grandview Suites Hotel)**

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

   City of Burbank
   Community Development Department
   Planning & Transportation Division
   150 North Third Street
   Burbank, CA 91502

3. **Contact person and telephone number:**

   Abo Velasco, Associate Planner
   (818) 238-5250

4. **Project Location:**

   549 South San Fernando Boulevard
   Burbank, CA 91502

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

   Anthony Wrzosek/R.D. Olson Development
   2955 Main Street Third Floor
   Irvine, CA 92614

   Contact: Anthony Wrzosek

6. **General Plan designation:** The General Plan Land Use Designation is Mixed Commercial/Office/Industrial.

7. **Zoning:** The Project site is located within the South San Fernando Commercial subarea of the Burbank Center Plan (BCP) area and is zoned Burbank Center Commercial Manufacturing (BCCM).

8. **Description of project:** The project involves the development of a five-story hotel on an approximately 1.54-acre (gross) site on South San Fernando Boulevard between Providencia and Santa Anita Avenues in the City of Burbank. The proposed five-story hotel would be approximately 130,450 square feet and consist of 170 hotel rooms with a pool, fitness center, and one subterranean level of parking with 136 parking spaces. To allow the proposed hotel, a Development Review is required for new construction and a Variance is required for a parking reduction.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐	Aesthetics	☐	Agriculture and Forestry	☒	Air Quality
☐	Biological Resources	☒	Cultural Resources	☒	Geology/Soils
☒	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐	Hydrology/Water Quality
☐	Land Use Planning	☐	Mineral Resources	☒	Noise
☐	Population/Housing	☐	Public Services	☐	Recreation
☐	Transportation/Traffic	☐	Utilities/Service Systems	☒	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐	I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☒	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☐	I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
☐	I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

    a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

    b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

    c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a-b. The project site is not visible from a designated state scenic highway. There are no major trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or other scenic resources on or in proximity to the site. The Verdugo Mountains, located northeast of the project site, are partially visible from Providencia Avenue and Santa Anita Avenue west of San Fernando Boulevard and its sidewalks. The proposed five-story building and semi-subterranean parking structure would partially obscure the peripheral view of the Verdugo Mountains for someone traveling along Providencia Avenue and Santa Anita Avenue for a few seconds; however, the mountains would still be visible to travelers along most of these two side streets on clear days. In addition, numerous tall buildings are located within one block, and the proposed project would not introduce a visual element that is inconsistent with existing development. Therefore, impacts related to scenic vistas and resources would be **less than significant**.

c. The project site is currently developed with seven buildings that house auto repair shops, a bike shop, a lock smith supply shop, and a vacant warehouse building. These buildings have low to moderate aesthetic interest. Surrounding buildings range from multi-story residential buildings up to eight stories on Verdugo Avenue and South San Fernando Boulevard to one-story commercial buildings directly adjacent to the site. The project site is relatively uniform in elevation, sloping slightly to the south and west. Site photographs in Figure 3a-3c show the existing visual character on and around the site.

The existing aesthetic character of the project site and vicinity is highly developed and urban in nature. A five-story hotel would be consistent with this development and serve to visually unify the project site with the surrounding land uses. Specifically, the hotel would visually unify the properties to the north, which are developed with larger residential buildings ranging in size from five to eight stories. There are also several structures three-stories and lower in the vicinity of the project as well. Although the proposed project would be slightly taller than some adjacent development, it would be consistent with the urban character and general height profile of the vicinity as well as the Burbank Center Plan. As part of the daily operations of the auto related businesses a minimum of two-dozen inoperative vehicles are kept on the property. These unattractive auto-related uses would be replaced with an attractive five-story hotel designed with highly articulated facades and a modern urban architectural style, which would enhance the visual appearance of the property and surrounding neighborhood. The project would replace the existing development on the site with larger-scale development, both in height and site coverage; however, this change would not be considered adverse, particularly as the existing development is not of high aesthetic value and the proposed scale is compatible with that of surrounding development. In addition, the proposed landscaping, as shown on Figure 4b (landscape plan) would include street trees, ornamental trees, and shrubs, which would soften the overall

visual character of the site at ground level compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings, and impacts would be **less than significant**.

d. The project site is within a highly urbanized area that includes various existing sources of light and glare, including streetlights, traffic lights, security lighting, signage, parked vehicles and reflective building surfaces. Overall project lighting is expected to be similar to that of the surrounding properties within the vicinity. Project development is therefore not anticipated to create a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views and. The project's impact associated with lighting and glare would be **less than significant.**

2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. The Project site is in an urbanized area and has no agricultural uses. The project site does not contain designated Prime, Unique, or Statewide Importance farmland and no active farmland is located in the site vicinity. Therefore, there is **no impact** and no further evaluation is needed.

b. Since on-site agricultural uses are not present, the proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. There are no Williamson Act contracts in the City of Burbank. Therefore, there is **no impact** and no further evaluation is needed.

c. The Project site is currently developed and the proposed project will not affect agricultural resources or operations. Therefore, there is **no impact** and no further evaluation is needed.

d. The Project site is currently developed and contains no forest or timberland uses. Therefore, there is **no impact** and no further evaluation is needed.

e. The Project site is currently developed and contains no forest land and would not convert forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, there is **no impact** and no further evaluation is needed.

3. Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Result in a temporary increase in the concentration of criteria pollutants (i.e., as a result of the operation of machinery or grading activities)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines states that the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district may be relied upon to make significance determinations. The SCAQMD has established significance thresholds to assess the regional and localized impacts of project-related air pollutant emissions; Table 1 presents the most current significance thresholds. A project with daily emission rates, risk values, or concentrations below these thresholds is generally considered to have a less than significant effect on air quality.

a. The proposed project is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is within the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD *Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan* (AQMP) is the air quality Plan that was adopted by the SCAQMD on December 7, 2012. The 2012 AQMP is an update to the 2007 AQMP and incorporates the latest scientific technology data, primarily in the form of updated federal requirements, implementation of new technology measures, and the continued development of compliance approvals. For a project to be consistent with the AQMP, the pollutants emitted from the project should not exceed the SCAQMD CEQA air quality significance thresholds or cause a significant impact on air quality. As shown in response b-d below, pollutant emissions from the proposed Project would be less than the SCAQMD thresholds and would not result in a significant impact. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP and would be considered **less than significant with mitigation.**

b. As shown in response e below, pollutant emissions from the proposed Project, with mitigation, would be less than the SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds. Further, as discussed below, pollutant emissions from the project would be less than the SCAQMD thresholds and would not result in significant impacts. Therefore, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and would be considered **less than significant with mitigation.**

c. The project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is subject to compliance with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (2012). The South Coast Air Basin is currently in non-attainment status of state regulatory standards for ozone (O3), fine particulate matter (PM10), and carbon monoxide (CO). A project's impact is significant if project-generated emissions exceed any of the following thresholds for criteria pollutants found in Table 1. As shown below, the emissions from the project would not exceed the SCAQMD Air Quality Thresholds. The magnitude of emissions would not be cumulatively considerable and the cumulative impact would be **less than significant**.

Table 1

SCAQMD Air Quality Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
NO_x	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM_{10}	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
$PM_{2.5}$	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.

Short-term cumulative impacts related to air quality could occur if project construction and nearby construction activities were to occur simultaneously. In particular, with respect to local impacts, cumulative construction impacts are considered when projects are located within a few hundred yards from each other. A six-story Hilton hotel was recently approved to be constructed approximately 200 feet north of the site. If construction of the proposed project begins in December 2012 there would be an overlap in construction. Though there could be some potential overlap the proposed project does not require a significant amount of mass grading as the project includes only one level of subterranean parking. This would cut down on the amount of time that sensitive receptors would be exposed to the construction emissions and reduce the quantity of construction emissions released. Additionally, by the time construction begins on the proposed project, the Hilton hotel will have completed the grading and site preparation phase of construction. Therefore, the phase which releases the greatest amounts of particulates will be staggered, reducing the cumulative impact of both projects. As shown in Table 2 construction emissions would be below the SCAQMD regional thresholds and below the localized significance thresholds with mitigation. As such, construction of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable and project impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

d. Construction Emissions. Construction vehicles and equipment traveling along unpaved roads, grading, trenching, and stockpiled soils have the potential to generate fugitive dust (PM10 and PM2.5) through the exposure of soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment. In addition, exhaust emissions associated with heavy construction equipment would potentially degrade air quality. PM10, PM2.5 and exhaust emissions associated with construction activities are considered to be temporary air quality impacts. Temporary construction emissions were estimated using the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2011.1.1 (see Appendix A for air quality data).

The number and type of equipment to be used during construction were estimated based on similar construction projects and confirmed with the applicant. During project site preparation, the soils that underlie

portions of the site could be turned over and pushed around, exposing the soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment by onsite operating equipment. The majority of emissions associated with construction activities on site come from off-road vehicles such as cranes and backhoes, but some emissions are also associated with construction worker trips and the application of architectural coatings, which release volatile or reactive organic gases (ROG) during the drying phase. Table 2 shows maximum daily unmitigated construction emissions.

Table 2
Maximum Daily Unmitigated Construction Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (maximum lbs/day)				
	ROG	**NOx**	**CO**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Demolition	7.90	63.58	37.23	5.56	3.10
Site Preparation	8.86	71.48	40.26	21.41	13.27
Paving	5.20	32.09	20.70	2.74	2.74
Grading	5.47	42.28	27.39	11.77	5.52
Building Construction	4.29	29.09	20.75	1.79	1.79
Architectural Coating	26.91	2.77	1.92	0.24	0.24
Maximum Daily Emissions	**32.46**	**71.57**	**41.51**	**21.61**	**13.28**
Threshold (peak day)	75	100	550	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMOD V. 2011.1.1

As indicated in Table 2, construction-related emissions generated by the proposed project would be below SCAQMD regional thresholds of significance. Consequently, the project would not have a cumulative considerable impact from construction emissions. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant.**

Rule 403 of the SCAQMD Handbook requires implementation of measures to minimize emissions for all dust generating activity, regardless of whether it exceeds the thresholds. The non-attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin for PM_{10} dust emissions requires that Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) such as adequate watering and the utilization of vegetative covering be implemented to minimize regional cumulative PM_{10} impacts from all construction activities, even if any single project does not cause the thresholds to be exceeded. Additionally, the non-attainment basin status and the cumulative impact of all construction suggests that all reasonably available control measures for diesel exhaust shall be implemented even if individual thresholds are not exceeded.

Operational Emissions. Long-term emissions associated with the proposed project, were estimated using the CalEEMod Computer model. Operational emissions were determined based on the combined annual emissions report created by CalEEMod. Appendix A contains the CalEEMod modeling assumptions and detailed results. Project emissions estimates, as determined in the modeling analysis, are presented in Table 3. The use of natural gas, hearth, and landscaping maintenance equipment are included in the area emissions. Therefore, the long-term emissions associated with the proposed project would be **less than significant**.

Table 3
Operational Emissions

Emission Source	Emissions (maximum lbs/day)				
	ROG	**NOx**	**CO**	**PM10**	**PM2.5**
Area Emissions	12.45	14.81	53.41	9.41	.71
SCAQMD Thresholds	**75**	**55**	**550**	**150**	**55**
Exceeds Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: CalEEMod v.2011.1.1 (See Appendix A for model assumptions and results).

e. In addition to the regional air quality thresholds shown in Table 1, SCAQMD has developed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) in response to the Governing Board's Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (1-4), which was prepared to update the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. LSTs were devised in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, and distance to the sensitive receptor, etc. However, LSTs only apply to emissions within a fixed stationary location, including idling emissions during both project construction and operation, and LSTs have been developed only for NOx, CO, PM10 and PM2.5. LSTs are not applicable to mobile sources such as cars on a roadway (Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, SCAQMD, June 2003). As such, LSTs for operational emissions would not apply to the proposed project as the majority of emissions would be generated by cars on the roadways.

LSTs have been developed for emissions within areas up to 5 acres in size, with air pollutant modeling recommended for activity within larger areas. The SCAQMD provides lookup table for project sites that measure 1, 2 or 5 acres. The project site measures approximately 1.54 acres and is located in Source Receptor Area 7 (SRA-7), which is designated by the SCAQMD as the East Fernando Valley and includes the City of Burbank. The LST construction emission thresholds shown in Table 4 are interpolated from the lookup tables for 1- and 2-acre sites.

Table 4
SCAQMD LSTs for Construction in SRA-7

Pollutant	Allowable emissions 82 feet from the 1.54-acre site boundary (lbs/day)
Gradual conversion of NO_x to NO_2	98
CO	653
PM_{10} (10.4 mg/m^3)	5.62
$PM_{2.5}$ (10.4 mg/m^3)	3.54

Source: http://www.aqmd.gov/CEQA/handbook/LST/appC.pdf, accessed online August 2013.

Certain population groups are considered more sensitive to air pollution than others. Children, the elderly and chronically ill persons, especially those with cardio-respiratory diseases, are particularly vulnerable. Sensitive land uses include those locations where such individuals are concentrated, such as hospitals, schools, and residences. Sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed site include a multi-family residential building adjacent to the property on Santa Anita Avenue, a park across the street at the corner of San Fernando Blvd and Providencia Ave, an elementary school on the northeast corner of San Fernando Boulevard and Santa Anita, and an apartment complex on the southeast corner of San Fernando Boulevard and Providencia Avenue. Without mitigation, as shown in Table 5, emissions from the proposed project would exceed the SCAQMD'S daily construction thresholds for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. However, the CalEEMod identified several mitigation measures that reduce the emission levels below the Localized Significant Thresholds. Table 6 shows that the emissions from the proposed project, with mitigation, would be below the Localized Significant Thresholds.

Table 5

Total On-Site Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions for LSTs Without Mitigation

	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Demolition	4.28	6.41	1.52	.26
Site Preparation	40.26	71.48	21.41	13.27
Grading	27.39	42.26	11.77	5.52
Building	20.75	29.09	1.79	1.79
Arch Coating and Paving	1.92	2.77	.24	.24
Maximum Daily Emissions*	**41.51**	**71.57**	**21.61**	**13.28**
Localized Significance Thresholds	*653*	*98*	*5.62*	*3.54*
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, which include the mitigation measures identified in the CalEEMod have been imposed to reduce the impacts to less than significant as determined in the CalEEMod modeling assumptions and detailed results. Project emissions estimates, as determined in the modeling analysis, are presented in Table 6 and they show that with mitigation, the impacts are below the Localized Significance Thresholds. Therefore the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be **less than significant with mitigation.**

Table 6

Total On-Site Construction Criteria Pollutant Emissions for LSTs With Mitigation

	CO	NO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Demolition	37.23	63.58	3.10	3.10
Site Preparation	40.26	71.48	3.34	3.34
Grading	27.39	42.26	2.21	2.21
Building	20.75	29.09	1.79	1.79
Arch Coating	1.92	2.77	.24	.24
Maximum Daily Emissions*	**41.51**	**71.57**	**3.40**	**3.35**
Localized Significance Thresholds	*653*	*98*	*5.62*	*3.54*
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

f. The proposed project involves a hotel development. This use is not expected to create any objectionable odors. Although the proposed project will have food service in a café area serving only breakfast, any odors emitted would be minimal. Additionally, in accordance with current practices and to assure vector control, food wastes are disposed of in covered receptacles and routinely removed, thereby limiting the escape of odors to the open air. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

The following mitigations are required to ensure potential air quality impacts to adjacent uses are reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: **Construction equipment controls** shall be implemented during construction to minimize emissions associated with off-road diesel construction equipment, which include:

i. Heavy-duty diesel-powered construction equipment shall be compliant with federally mandated clean diesel engines (EPA Tier 4) and shall be utilized wherever feasible.
ii. Construction contractors shall minimize equipment idling throughout construction. Engines shall be turned off if idling would be for more than five minutes.
iii. Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications.
iv. The number of pieces of equipment operating simultaneously shall be minimized.
v. Construction contractors shall use alternatively fueled construction equipment (such as compressed or liquefied natural gas, or electric) when feasible.
vi. The engine size of construction equipment shall be the minimum practical size.

AQ-2 Fugitive Dust Controls shall be implemented during construction to minimize fugitive dust emissions, which include:

I. Water trucks must be used during construction to keep all areas of vehicle movements damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will require three daily applications (once in the morning, midday, and at the end of the workday). The construction site watering frequency shall be increased whenever sustained wind speed exceeds 15 mph. All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities must cease during periods of high winds (greater than 25 mph averaged over one hour) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
II. Soil with 5% or greater silt content that is stockpiled for more than two days must be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation.
III. Trucks transporting material must be tarped from the point of origin or must maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
IV. Soil stabilizers must be applied to unpaved roads to prevent excess amounts of dust.
V. All material excavated or graded must be treated with soil binders or must be sufficiently watered at least three times daily with complete coverage, preferably in the morning, midday, and after work is done for the day.
VI. Ground cover must be replaced in disturbed areas as quickly as possible
VII. The contractor must provide adequate loading/unloading areas that limit truck-out onto adjacent roadways through the utilization of wheel washing, rumble plates, or another method of achieving the same intent.
VIII. All material transported off-site must be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
IX. Water unpaved roads and clean paved roads.
X. Use low Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) paint for interior and exterior painting.
XI. No hearths installed.
XII. Use Low VOC cleaning supplies.

4. Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a-f The project site is in a highly urbanized area lacking native biological habitats. The site is almost entirely paved and does not contain habitat for special status plant species or wildlife, nor does it contain wetlands, riparian habitats, or wildlife movement corridors (see site photos on Figures 3a-3c). The site is not subject to an adopted habitat conservation plan and the project would not conflict with any local biological resource protection policies (City of Burbank Land Use Element). **No impact** to biological resources would occur.

5. Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a. A variety of federal, state, and locally recognized historic resources are located in Burbank. Various resources are listed in or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and/or the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or as a California Point of Historical Interest. However, the project site is developed with auto repair and auto body shops; parking lots; covered auto repair bays; and a vacant warehouse building; and does not contain any known resources of historic significance (see site photos on Figures 3a-3c). Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

b-d. The site has been previously graded and paved; therefore, the likelihood that intact archaeological resources, paleontological resources, or human remains are present is low. The site is relatively flat and does not contain unique geologic features. Because the project site has been developed previously, any surficial paleontological resources that may have been present at one time have likely already been disturbed. Therefore, the topmost layers of soil in the project area are not likely to contain substantive fossils. However, the proposed subterranean parking structure and foundation for the building would require excavation into the deeper soils and potentially uncover undocumented historical resources. Although project implementation is not expected to uncover archaeological resources, paleontological resources or human remains, the possibility for such resources does exist but impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation**.

However, the following mitigation measures would reduce the impact to unknown cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

CR-1 Resource Recovery Procedures. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within the vicinity of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. At that time, a Native American representative shall be retained to monitor any mitigation work if Native American cultural material is found. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

CR-2 Human Remains Recovery Procedures. If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to the origin and disposition pursuant to the Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume.

6. Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☒	☐	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

A Geotechnical Engineering Investigation was prepared for the proposed project by Geotechnologies Inc. in December 2012. The following analysis is partially based on the report prepared by Geotechnologies, which is contained in Appendix B.

a i-ii. Like much of Southern California, the project site could experience severe seismic ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The Verdugo fault, located along the lower slopes of the Verdugo Mountains, is the only active or potentially active fault in Burbank (City of Burbank Land Use Element). Onsite structures would be constructed to withstand potential peak accelerations onsite, as defined by the California Building Code (CBC) and the Unified Building Code (UBC). In addition, project construction would be subject to review and approval by the City's building and safety officials and would need to adhere to the recommendations of the geotechnical study prepared for the project site. Compliance with these requirements would minimize the potential for damage relating to fault rupture and seismic ground shaking to a **less than significant with mitigation** level.

a iii.,c. The Seismic Hazards Maps of the State of California (CDMG, 1999), classifies the site as part of the potentially "Liquefiable" area. A site-specific liquefaction analysis was performed following the Recommended Procedures for Implementation of the California Geologic Survey Publication 117A, Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (CGS, 2008). Groundwater was not encountered during exploration, conducted to a maximum depth of 57 feet below the ground surface. According to the Seismic Hazard Zone Report of the Burbank 7 1/2 – Minute Quadrangle (CDMG, 1998, Revised 2006), the historic-high groundwater level was conservatively utilized for the enclosed liquefaction analysis. The site-specific liquefaction analysis included in the Appendix of the Geotechnical report, indicates that the site soils would not be prone to liquefaction during seismic activity based on the collected materials

that were conveyed to a laboratory for testing and analysis. Therefore, impacts associated with liquefaction are **less than significant**.

a iv. The project area is generally flat and therefore is not susceptible to landslide hazards. The site is not within a designated landslide hazard area (California Department of Conservation, 1999). Therefore, **no impact** related to landslide hazards would occur.

b. The project site has been previously graded and is currently paved. Grading and construction activities, including excavation for subterranean parking, on the project site would be subject to all applicable construction Best Management Practices (BMPs), used to control pollutant discharges from major construction materials, wastes, and activities, pursuant to Title 9 of the City of Burbank Municipal Code. Implementation of construction BMPs, which are required by BMC Title 9, would reduce erosion-related impacts to a **less than significant** level.

d. Expansive soils expand or swell when wetted, and contract or shrink when dried. The onsite geologic materials are in the very low to low expansion range. The Expansion index was found to be between 0 and 72 for bulk samples remolded to 90 percent of the laboratory maximum density. Additional reinforcing is required as noted in the "Foundation Design" and "Slabs on Grade" sections of Appendix B of the Geotechnical report. Design and construction of the project would be required to adhere to the recommendations listed in the standard procedures of the California Building Code to reduce any potential impacts from expansive soils on the site. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

e. The project would connect to existing sewer infrastructure. Septic tanks would not be used onsite and **no impact** would occur in this regard.

Mitigation Measures

GS1 – The applicant shall adhere to the recommendations of the geotechnical study prepared for the project site.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the Project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a-b The City has a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan (GGRP) as part of City of Burbank's General Plan (Burbank 2035) that outlines a plan for the City of Burbank to work toward Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reductions of 15 percent below 2010 levels by 2020, and 30 percent below 2010 levels by 2035. Implementing the GGRP would reduce community-wide GHG. Furthermore, the GGRP is the primary tool the City will use to achieve GHG reduction goals and demonstrate consistency with AB 32 and the ARB *Climate Change Scoping Plan*.

Construction-related GHG emissions would be generated primarily from off-road heavy-duty equipment, material delivery trucks, and construction vehicles. Although these emissions would be temporary and cease following completion of the proposed Project, construction emissions could generate a substantial amount of GHG emissions. Demolition, site preparation, and construction emissions were estimated via modeling associated with implementation of the proposed Project using CALEE version 2011.1.1.

To reduce construction emissions, both SCAQMD-required construct best practices and the use of low-emissions construction practices would be employed. Additionally, a mitigation measure will be required for the demolition contractor to recycle or salvage a portion of non-hazardous debris. In order to comply with this requirement, the applicant shall submit a Construction Waste Management Plan that assures that at least 50 percent of the non-hazardous construction waste is recycled or reused.

Neither SCAQMD nor the City of Burbank has adopted a significance threshold for analyzing GHG emissions from plans or development projects or a methodology for analyzing GHG emissions impacts. To date, SCAQMD has only recommended and adopted an interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for stationary sources (10,000 MT CO2e). The proposed thresholds have not been updated to reflect recent revisions by ARB that account for adjustments in future emissions due to recessed economic conditions and current state level legislation. Based on the results shown in the CALEE modeling assumptions located in Appendix A, 7,689.21 MT CO2e would be the highest amount of emissions during the construction phase and 9,460.97 MT CO2e during the operations as measured through annual tons per year, which is AEI Consultants Environmental & Engineering Services, "Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment", February 2013. below the maximum threshold.

The GGRP has been developed to reduce GHG emissions pursuant to AB 32 GHG reduction goals. The GGRP has established policies and measures that address a broad range of Project related GHG emission sources (I.e., transportation, energy, solid waste, and water). The GGRP also established policies and measures to address the energy sector. In addition, GGRP measures address energy efficiency and conservation, passive energy conservation, and renewable energy. The GGRP focuses on energy reduction through passive energy conservation, which reduces energy consumption through building design (e.g., shade trees or external shades). Several Building code requirements have been added to reduce GHG emissions in compliance with the GGRP requirements such as Title 24, which requires the use of energy efficient material and fixtures.

As discussed above, the principal State plan and policy adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions is AB 32. The quantitative goal of AB32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard are being implemented at the statewide level, and compliance at the specific plan or project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed project does not conflict with these plans and regulations. The regulations, plans, and policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions that are directly applicable to the proposed project include Title 24 Energy Efficiency standards for Nonresidential Buildings and the Title 24 California Green Building Standards Code. The proposed project would be developed in compliance with the requirements of these regulations, which have been added as Mitigation Measures.

In summary, the proposed project would not conflict with the State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, Therefore, impacts will be **less than significant with mitigation measures**.

Mitigation Measures

GGE-1 Prior to the approval of the demolition permit, the Applicant shall submit a Construction Waste Management Plan that assures that at least 50 percent of the non-hazardous construction waste is recycled or reused.

GGE-2 The project shall comply with Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards for Nonresidential Buildings and the Title 24 California Green Building Standards Code to the satisfaction of the Building Division.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HAZARDS ND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. Operation of the proposed project, which includes a hotel use, would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials other than cleaning solutions used to clean the hotel. Therefore, impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal would be **less than significant**.

b,d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared in 2012 for the project site by AEI Consultants, Environmental & Engineering Services (Appendix D). The report indicated that there were several Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) that warrant a Phase II analysis. RECs are defined by the ASTM Standard Practice E1527-05 as the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property. AEI's assessment has revealed the following RECs associated with the subject property or nearby properties:

- The subject property has been utilized as an auto repair facility since at least 1923 and was developed with the current buildings between 1926 and 1947. The subject property was also equipped with two underground storage tanks, one 1,000-gallon waste oil tank and one 3,000-gallon diesel tank, from 1968 to 1990. AEI observed several storm drains and two sumps on the subject property. The liquid in the drains and sumps was observed with an oily sheen, which likely contains materials and runoff from the auto repair operations.
- During a site inspection, AEI observed six, parts washers on the property with at least one still being used. This parts washer is is used in conjunction with an acetone based solvent, with small amounts of parachlorobenzotriflouride, to clean spray guns associated with the on-site spray booths. Information obtained from the Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) website, acknowledges that hydrocarbon based solvents were utilized at the property in 1994, and tetrachloroethylene was utilized at the property from at least 1999 to 2000.
- At the time of the site inspection, AEI observed two active spray paint booths and two historically active paint spray booths. Records with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) indicate unspecified solvent waste was generated on one of the subject parcels from at least 1996 to the present day. DTSC records also indicate the use of tetrachloroethylene 2000, and other unspecified solvents in 2009 on separate subject parcel. In addition, the regulatory database report identified the subject property as a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act and Small Quantity Generators (RCRA-SQG) site for the generation of tetrachloroethylene and aqueous solutions with organic residues in 2000. SQG sites are sites that generate more than 100 kilograms, but less than 1,000 kilograms, of hazardous waste per month. AEI did not observe any containers of tetrachloroethylene at the site during the site reconnaissance.
- AEI also observed several historic underground lifts throughout the auto repair and auto body facilities. Based on the possibility of the pre-1977 installation of the lifts, the potential exists that the hydraulic fluid within the lift system previously contained polychoorinated byphenyls (PCBs).
- A building record from 1992 associated with the property indicated a clarifier was removed from the property. At the time of the site reconnaissance, AEI did not observe remnants of an on-site clarifier and there was no other information to indicate the presence of one on the site.

Based on the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, AEI conducted a Phase II Subsurface Investigation in order to further evaluate if subsurface contamination is present on the subject property due to historical and current automotive repair station operations (Appendix E). On January 14, 2013, as part of the Phase II ESA, 11 soil borings were advanced on the subject property. The borings were advanced to depths

between 15 and 20 feet bgs. Temporary soil vapor probes were installed at each boring location. Borings were advanced at select locations of current and previously suspect automotive operations that could have impacted the subject property.

The results of the investigation were compared to California Human Health Screening Levels (CHHSLS), California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Los Angeles Region Maximum SSLs, California Background Metals levels, and RSLs to measure levels found to be dangerous to humans. The following information is a summary of the soil vapor sample analytical test results:

- A hydrocarbon (a composite of indistinguishable high to mid-range hydrocarbons) was detected in one of the 22 soil vapor samples analyzed. The hydrocarbon was detected at 2/1 microgram per liter, which does not have a comparison value.
- Toluene was detected in one of the 22 soil vapor samples analyzed. The concentration detected was 0.6 microgram per liter, which does not exceed the CHHSLs (378 microgram per liter).
- No other VOCs were detected in the soil vapor samples at concentrations, which exceed the laboratory detection limits.

The following information is a summary of the soil sample analytical test results:

- TPH-g, TPH-d, and TPH-o were not detected in samples from any of the borings above the laboratory detection limits.
- The metal arsenic was detected at 3.7 milligrams per kilogram at one of the boring locations and at 3.1 micrograms per kilogram at another boring location, which exceeds the RSLs (1.6 micrograms per kilogram). However, these concentrations do not exceed the maximum background concentration of arsenic in California soils (11 milligrams per kilogram).
- No other metals were detected in the soils at concentrations, which exceed the EPA region 9 industrial RSLs.

The metal arsenic was detected at concentrations, which exceeds the RSLs. However, these concentrations do not exceed the maximum background concentration of arsenic in California soils. Due to the lack of a release detected, AEI does not recommend any further action for the subject property at this time (Appendix E). However, it may be prudent to plan for the presence of soil contamination in the vicinity of the waste

- A hydrocarbon (a composite of indistinguishable higher to mid-range hydrocarbons) was detected fin 1 of the 22 soil vapor samples analyzed. The hydrocarbon was detected in AEI-B5 at 2.1 microgram per liter (which does not have a comparison value.
- GZA was unable to verify the existence of hydrocarbon contamination near the waste oil above storage tank (AST) identified by AES in 2008, despite the installation of four boreholes in this area. We conclude that the contamination is not likely to have significant extent in this area.
- Except for arsenic, no targeted compound was detected at concentrations exceeding their CHHSLs. Arsenic was detected in all soil samples for which it was tested, and appears to be indicative of natural conditions.
- GZA's study revealed no evidence of the presence of USTs or related equipment, or evidence of contamination from the former gasoline station operations. The study was performed in accordance with California protocols and standard industry practice. No further actions are recommended regarding this issue.

Based on the results from GZA's Phase II ESA, no further investigation for soils in the areas investigated is recommended. However, it may be prudent to plan for the presence of soil contamination on the property. As such, impacts would be **less than significant with mitigation measures**, which are as listed at the end of the section.

In addition, affiliation in the Los Angeles County Fire Department's Health Hazardous Material Division (HHMD) is required and would reduce impacts related to the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The HHMD (and its Participating Agency the /Burbank City Fire Department) is recognized as a Certified Unified program Agency (CUPA) whose responsibility is to implement the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials management Regulatory Program. This program includes elements addressing hazardous waste generation, above ground storage tanks, underground storage tanks, hazardous materials release response plans, and more.

c. The Burbank Community Day School, part of the /Burbank Unified School District, is located less than one-tenth (0.1) of a mile from the project site. The proposed project has the potential to adversely affect this sensitive receptor as demolition of the existing structures, which, due to their age, may contain asbestos and lead based paints and materials. However, the removal of any asbestos-containing materials would be required to comply with all applicable existing rules and regulations, including SCAQMD rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities). In addition, the proposed project would have to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) regulations regarding lead-based materials. The California Code of Regulations, CS1532.1, require testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials such that exposure levels do not exceed CalOSHA standards. The demolition company must show these regulations as verified by the Building Division. Adherence to all applicable SCAQMD Rules and CalOSHA regulations would reduce impacts to **less than significant.**

e. The project site is located in Zone 5 of the Bob Hope/Burbank Airport Approach Area (Federal Aviation Administration Filing Requirement Map, 2005), and is approximately 2.7 miles southeast of the Bob Hope/Burbank Airport. Since the proposed building does not exceed height to distance ratios set forth by the FAA, it is not required to obtain clearance by the FAA prior to receiving a building permit from the City (City of Burbank Land Use Element). Further, the site is not within an airport land use plan nor within two-miles of an airport. Therefore, impacts related to airport safety clearance would be **less than significant.**

f. The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip **No impact** would occur.

g. The Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) Health Hazardous Materials Division is the Certified Unified program Agency (CUPA) for the City of Burbank, with the Burbank Fire Department (BFD) authorized as a participating agency. The LADFD and the BFD work together to implement the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan that addresses Burbank's Planned response to emergencies. Since the proposed project is not expected to restrict access or movement along South San Fernando Boulevard or Santa Anita Avenue. It would not interfere with any emergency response plan or evacuation route. Impacts would be **Less than significant.**

h. Implementation of the proposed project will establish a new hotel use on the Project site, which will not conflict with the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan. Also, short-term impacts on emergency response to the project site may result during construction activities. Affected agencies will be consulted regarding the compatibility of the proposed project with City emergency plans and evacuation routes. Overall, the project will not result in exposure to wildfire risk because of its location in an urbanized area outside of the two established mountain Fire Zones within the City. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts related to soil contamination to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1 Excavation and Demolition Contingency Plans. All excavation and demolition activities conducted on the project site shall have a contingency plan to be implemented in the event that contaminants or structural features that could be associated with contaminants or hazardous materials are suspected or discovered. The contingency plan shall identify appropriate measures to be followed if contaminants are found or suspected. The appropriate measures shall identify personnel to be notified, emergency contacts, and a sampling protocol to be

implemented. The excavation and demolition contractors shall be made aware of the possibility of encountering unknown hazardous materials, and shall be provided with appropriate contact and notification information. The contingency plan shall include a provision stating at what point it is safe to continue with the excavation or demolition, and identify the person authorized to make that determination. The contingency plan will be submitted for review and approval from the Burbank Fire Department and Community Development /Department prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permit.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to develop water quality standards to protect the beneficial uses of receiving waters. In accordance with California's Porter/Cologne Act, the Regional Water

Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are required to develop water quality objectives that ensure their region meets the requirements of Section 303 of the Clean Water Act. Burbank is within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB. The Los Angeles RWQCB adopted water quality objectives in its Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SQMP). This SQMP is designed to ensure stormwater generated by a development does not exceed the limitations of receiving waters, and thus does not exceed water quality standards. Section 402 of the Clean Water Act ensures compliance with the SQMP. Under this section, municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdiction. These permits are part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, and are known as Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permits. Under this MS4, each permitted municipality is required to implement the SQMP. In accordance with the County-wide MS4 permit, all new developments must comply with the SQMP. In addition, as required by the MS4 permit, the City of Burbank has adopted a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) ordinance to ensure new developments comply with SQMP. The City's SUSMP ordinance requires new developments to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. This ordinance also requires most new developments to submit a plan to the City that demonstrates how the project will comply with the City's SUSMP and identifies the project-specific BMP that will be implemented. Mandatory ordinances would ensure compliance with applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. Therefore, impacts related to water quality and waste discharge would be **less than significant**.

b. The project site, as it currently exists, is entirely paved. Upon buildout of the proposed project, impervious surfaces would cover the majority of the project site, with the exception of some perimeter landscaping and several planters throughout the site. Therefore, the project would incrementally decrease the amount of impervious surface area which would decrease the flow rate and volume of stormwater. Therefore, groundwater recharge would not be adversely affected and impacts would be **less than significant**.

c,d. The project site, as it currently exists, is covered entirely with impervious surfaces. The proposed project would not alter any streams or rivers as none are located on the project site. As mentioned above, proposed perimeter landscaping and several planters throughout the site would incrementally decrease the flow rate and volume of stormwater. The proposed project would be subject to SQMP, NPDES, the Los Angeles County Stormwater Ordinance and the SUSMP which require the implementation of BMPs to control erosion, siltation and on and offsite flooding during both construction and operation of the project. It is expected that the implementation of mandatory BMPs would improve the onsite drainage pattern over existing onsite conditions. Therefore, because the proposed project would control runoff and hazards of potential flooding through its adherence to the above-required measures and an adequate existing storm drainage system, siltation, erosion and flood related impacts from the project would be **less than significant**.

e-f. As discussed above, the proposed project would incrementally decrease stormwater flow by decreasing the amount of impervious surfaces through the introduction of perimeter landscaping and several planters throughout the site. It is expected that the implementation of mandatory BMPs pursuant to SQMP, the Los Angeles County Stormwater Ordinance and the SUSMP, would improve the onsite drainage pattern and decrease the amount of polluted runoff over existing onsite conditions. Furthermore, with auto-repair being the main use with two large on-site parking lots, and given that auto-repair and parking lot runoff is generally more polluted than runoff from rooftops and courtyard areas, the amount of polluted runoff may incrementally decrease as a result of the proposed project which would replace the auto-repair uses and does not include any surface parking (parking would be located in the one-level subterranean garage). Grading activities would be subject to the City's SUSMP ordinance and implementation of standard erosion control BMPs would reduce water quality impacts to the maximum extent practicable. Impacts would be **less than significant**.

Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act and the State require that for projects which would disturb an area greater than one acre during construction, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) State General Construction Permit must be obtained. The proposed project would disturb more than one acre of land, therefore a State Permit would be required.

g-i. The structural development associated with the proposed project would not impede or redirect flood flows, and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding. The project site is located within Zone X, which indicates that the site is outside the 100-year flood zone (FEMA Panel No. 0650180005C). In addition, the City of Burbank Land Use Plan does not identify the project site as being within a flood hazard zone. Therefore, impacts related to flooding would be **less than significant**.

j. Although the project site is located within a seismically active area, it is not located near the Pacific Ocean or a body of water that could be subject to a tsunami, seiche event, or significant mudflow. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

10. Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. The project site is located on the western side of San Fernando Boulevard between Santa Anita and Providencia Avenues. Adjacent to the property is a one-story apartment building, a recording studio, and a community park. Further southeast of the site, is a two-story apartment building and further west of the site are industrial and commercial uses. The existing street network would maintain its current design and functionality. Further, the project would not block or prevent the use of any existing vehicle or pedestrian infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed project would not divide an established community. **No impact** would occur.

b. The project site currently has a General Plan designation of Mixed Commercial/Office/Industrial and a zoning designation of Burbank Center Commercial Manufacturing (BCCM). The proposed hotel is permitted in this zone, complies with the BCCM development standards, and is consistent with the General Plan Goals and policies. In addition, the project is within the Burbank Center Plan (BCP) area and would further the BCP policy supporting the conversion of declining commercial strip development to uses which have stronger market support and are suitable along arterial streets. The applicant is requesting a Variance from the zoning standard for parking as they have shown that their business doesn't need the Code required parking to operate effectively. Further, the number of parking spaces provided is the industry standard for hotels of this size. Therefore Impacts would be **less than significant** upon approval of the requested entitlement applications.

c. The project site is not within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. **No impact** would occur.

11. Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a-b. The project site is located in an area zoned for industrial and commercial uses. The City of Burbank's General Plan indicates the area is designated as Mixed Commercial/Office/Industrial and the zoning, as found in the Burbank Center Plan, is Burbank Center Commercial Manufacturing (BCCM). No mineral resource recovery sites are located within the City's zoning districts (City of Burbank Land Use Plan Map). Therefore, **no impact** related to energy and mineral resources or resource recovery sites would occur.

12. Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

Overview of Sound Measurement: Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound power levels

to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz).

The sound pressure level is measured on a logarithmic scale with the 0 dB level based on the lowest detectable sound pressure level that people can perceive (an audible sound that is not zero sound pressure level). Based on the logarithmic scale, a doubling of sound energy is equivalent to an increase of 3 dB and a sound that is 10 dB less than the ambient sound level has no effect on ambient noise. Because of the nature of the human ear, a sound must be about 10 dB greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dB change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dB changes generally are not perceived.

Noise levels typically attenuate at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from point sources such as industrial machinery. Noise from heavily traveled roads typically attenuates at about 3 dB per doubling of distance.

In addition to the actual instantaneous measurement of sound levels, the duration of sound is important since sounds that occur over a long period of time are more likely to be an annoyance or cause direct physical damage or environmental stress. One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound power level is the equivalent noise level (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time (essentially, the average noise level). Typically, Leq is summed over a one-hour period. In addition, the Lmax is often used when measuring noise event data. The Lmax is the maximum sound level during the measurement period.

Noise Setting: Some land uses are considered more sensitive to noise levels than others, due to the amount of noise exposure (in terms of both exposure time and insulation from noise) and the types of activities typically involved. Residences, motels and hotels, schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks, and outdoor recreation areas are generally considered more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses. There are many sensitive receptors near the site. Within 110 feet or less there are six sensitive receptors including recording studios, two apartment buildings, a park, and a school.

Section 9-3-209 of the Burbank Municipal Code limits the operation of construction equipment within 500 feet of a residential zone to between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM Monday through Friday and 8 AM to 5 PM on Saturdays. These restrictions would apply to the proposed project, as the closest sensitive receptors are adjacent to the project site. The grading/excavation phase of project construction tends to create the highest noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment. As shown in Table 7, noise levels associated with heavy equipment typically range from about 78 to 88 dBA at 50 feet from the source.

As shown in Table 8, Section 9-3-208 of the Burbank Municipal Code outlines exterior noise limits for uses within residential, commercial, and all other zones. This section specifies that the operation of any machinery, equipment, pump, fan, air conditioning apparatus, or similar mechanical device shall not cause the exterior ambient noise level to be exceeded by more than 5 dBA. Noise from construction, however, is exempt from these guidelines. In addition, Title 9 of the Burbank Municipal Code states that these noise limits shall be adjusted in certain situations, as shown in Table 9.

Table 7
Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites

Construction Phase	Average Noise Level at 50 Feet	
	Minimum Required Equipment On-Site	All Pertinent Equipment On-Site
Clearing	84 dBA	84 dBA
Excavation	78 dBA	88 dBA
Foundation/Conditioning	88 dBA	88 dBA
Laying Subbase, Paving	78 dBA	79 dBA
Finishing and Cleanup	84 dBA	84 dBA

Source: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, "Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances," prepared for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1971.

Table 8
Exterior Noise Limits

Region	Time	
	Day (7 a.m. - 10 p.m.)	Night (10 p.m. - 7 a.m.)
Commercial Zone	65 dBA	65 dBA
All Other Zones	70 dBA	70 dBA

Source: Burbank Municipal Code, Section 9-3-208

Table 9
Noise Limit Adjustments

Noise	Condition Correction (in dB)
(1) Repetitive impulsive noise	-5
(2) Steady whine, screech or hum	-5
(3) Noise occurring more than 5 but less than 15 minutes per hour*	+5
(4) Noise occurring more than 1 but less than 5 minutes per hour*	+10
(5) Noise occurring less than 1 minute per hour*	+20

**Applies only during the daytime.*

Source: Burbank Municipal Code, Section 9-3-208

Finally, according to Section 9-3-224 of the Burbank Municipal Code:

It shall be unlawful for any person to create any noise on any street, sidewalk or public place adjacent to any hospital or to any school, institution of learning or church while the same is in use, which noise unreasonably interferes with the workings of such institution or which disturbs or unduly annoys patients in the hospital,

provided conspicuous signs are displayed in such streets, sidewalk or public place indicating the presence of a school, church or hospital (Burbank Municipal Code).

a,c. Operational Noise: During project operation subterranean parking lot activity could generate periodic noise such as car horns, slamming of car doors and engine ignition. Given the local noise environment and land uses in the immediate project vicinity, the key noise issues relate to the project effects on residential uses surrounding the site (these residences are already exposed to auto repair, auto body shop, and parking lot noise form the current uses on the site). However, since the proposed project includes an underground parking garage, impacts related to operational noise would be less than what sensitive receptors currently experience from the existing auto repair/body shops and other uses. Therefore, noise generated onsite is not expected to adversely affect the residences and impacts would be **less than significant**.

b,d. Construction activities would generate temporary noise and vibrations that could be detectable on- and offsite. Construction of the proposed project would entail demolition, grading and construction of the facilities. There are several sensitive receptors within approximately 110 feet of the project site: residential development to the west, and southeast of the project site; two recording studios across the street to the north; a park to the south; and the Burbank Community Day School across San Fernando Boulevard northeast of the project site. Recording studios are considered noise sensitive because excessive vibrations or noise near the recording areas can impede the ability to effectively record sounds without distortion or interference.

Because the nearest residence is within 500 feet of the project site, construction activities would be limited to 7 AM and 7 PM Monday through Friday and 8 AM to 5 PM on Saturdays (Municipal Code Section 9-3-209). Construction noise during this period, specifically noise and vibrations associated with the excavation for the proposed two-story subterranean parking structure, has the potential to adversely affect sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site.

The nearby noise-sensitive land uses would be exposed to temporary construction noise during development of the proposed project. Noise impacts are a function of the type of activity being undertaken and the distance to the receptor location.

Table 7 shows typical noise levels associated with activities during various phases of construction at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source. Typical noise levels range from about 78 to 88 dB. The grading/excavation phase of project construction tends to create the highest construction noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment. However, during grading operations, the equipment would be dispersed in various portions of the site in both time and space. Physically, a limited amount of equipment can operate near a given location at a particular time.

The Burbank Municipal Code does not have specific standards for construction noise, although the Municipal Code Section 9-3-209 states that construction can occur between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM Monday through Friday, and 8 AM to 5 PM on Saturdays. The City of Burbank's General Plan Noise element, under Section VII, states "the impact of construction noise which occurs during the daytime is considered minimal for no more than two or three months of activity." Due to the depth of the one-level subterranean parking structure, the excavation phase of construction, which has the most vibration and noise related impacts, would require approximately two weeks. Due to the unique nature of a recording studio business, specific mitigation measures have been identified (N1-N16) to reduce the potential impacts to the business to a less than significant level. As such, noise impacts associated with construction would be **less than significant with mitigation measures**.

e,f. The project site is located in Zone 5 of the Bob Hope/Burbank Airport Approach Area (Federal Aviation Administration Filing Requirement Map, 2005). Refer to Section VII, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials,* for further discussion of the Airport Approach Area. The project site is not in the vicinity of any private airport. Noise associated with the Bob Hope/Burbank Airport is not expected to adversely affect the proposed project and there would be **no impacts**.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-17 would be required to reduce impacts related to vibration and noise associated with construction to a less than significant level.

N-1 Alternative Pile. If pile driving activities are required for construction, alternative pile types that are quieter to install, such as Nicholson Pin Piles, Tubex grout units or GeoJet foundation units, shall be utilized where feasible in place of traditional driven piles to reduce noise and vibration generation. The City of Burbank Building Division Manager shall determine the feasibility of these alternatives pile types for the required applications. Impact-type pile driving should not be used. If piles are needed, they should be drilled.

N-2 Additional Pile Driving Measures. If pile driving activities are required for construction, i.e. if alternative pile types are determined to be infeasible by the Building Division, a field test program shall be conducted on the site prior to approval of building plans. The test shall include driving piles at several locations on the project site in the general locations where piles would be required for project construction. The test shall also include testing of various noise control measures including, but not limited to, sound blanket enclosures around pile hammers. Quantitative noise and vibration measurements, together with a subjective assessment of the resulting conditions, shall be recorded. The results of the test program shall be presented to the City of Burbank Community Development Director. Based on the results of the tests, the Director shall have the right to require additional noise control measures at the site during pile driving, such as temporary sound berms and dampening enclosures.

N-3 **Staging Area.** Contractor shall configure and locate staging areas on site to minimize off-site transportation of heavy construction equipment. These areas shall be located to maximize the distance between activity and the nearest sensitive receptors; the recording studio, the apartment building abutting the project site, the park to the south, and the apartment southeast of the project site. At a minimum, the staging areas shall be located at a distance of 100 feet from the adjacent apartment building, the northwest property line, and the east property line. This would reduce noise impacts to adjacent sensitive receptors associated with most types of idling construction equipment.

N-4 Diesel Equipment Mufflers. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory- recommended mufflers.

N-5 Electrically-Powered Tools. Electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

N-6 Additional Noise Attenuation Techniques. For all noise-generating construction activity on the project site, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed to reduce noise levels. Such techniques shall include, but are not limited to, the use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment and the construction of temporary sound barriers between construction sites and nearby sensitive receptors.

N-7 Coordinate with neighbor. Coordinate construction activities with the production studio manager located adjacent to the subject property. Provide construction activity schedules and try to minimize noisy activities when recording is taking place.

N-8 Shielding wall. Provide a temporary shielding wall along the property lines abutting the adjacent apartment building west of the construction site, the north property line, and the south property line. This shielding wall should be sound blankets on poles or a wood frame. The shielding wall should consist of two layers of vinyl with lightweight fiberglass sandwiched between. The sound blankets should be sewed vertically and horizontally to prevent the fiberglass from settling. The sound blankets should be fitted with brass grommets on all sides to facilitate attaching them to the pole or wood frames. The sound blankets should have a minimum surface weight of 1.0 psf.

The shielding wall should extend to a height of 4 feet above the elevation of the roof at the east portion of the apartment building and the south portion of the recording studio. The height of the shielding wall along the south property line shall match the height of the park recreation building. The shielding wall should be erected before the start of construction. When the upper floors are being framed, the sound

blankets should be moved to the west wall of the building under construction. The sound blankets should remain until the building is closed.

N-9 **Coverage.** Provide sound blankets or ¾" plywood to cover the windows and glass block on the south wall of the production studio**.**

N-10 **Distance during construction.** Whenever possible, utilize noisy equipment toward the center of the site or along San Fernando Boulevard.

N-11 **Saws during demolition.** Use pavement saws during demolition of the existing asphalt and concrete instead of hoe-rams.

N-12 **Mixing trucks.** Use concrete mixing trucks to avoid mixing concrete on site. Where possible, construct foundation and subterranean wood frames off-site.

N-13 **Quiet equipment.** Utilize newer diesel generators and compressors that are listed as "quiet units" by the manufacturer.

N-14 **Back-up alarms.** Disconnect back-up alarms on vehicles that require them. Use signal men as required.

N-15 **Idling equipment.** Turn off all idling equipment when not in use for more than 15 minutes.

N-16 **Saw blades.** Use saw blades in electric saws that have vibration damping such as Daubert V-Damp.

13. Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. The South Coast Association of Government's 2008 Regional Transportation Growth Forecast estimates that the City of Burbank's 2010 population will be 112,103 and in 2035 the population will increase to 133,391. According to the California Department of Finance, there is an average of 2.506 persons per household in the City of Burbank (California Department of Finance, 2008). The proposed project involves the construction of a hotel with no residential units, which would not increase the population. As such, population growth associated with the proposed project does not exceed population forecasts. Further, while the opening of the hotel will generate a small number of new employment opportunities, an equivalent number of jobs will be removed as the existing auto-related businesses will be gone. Therefore, impacts related to population growth would be **less than significant**. No further analysis is needed.

b,c. Existing uses on the project site include retail and auto repair services. Thus, project implementation would not displace a substantial amount of people that would necessitate additional housing. **No impact** would occur.

14. Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
PUBLIC SERVICES				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
v. Other public services?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a. i-v) The project will not have a significant adverse impact on the provision of these services. The proposed hotel will be located on lots that were previously used as businesses including retail, auto shops, and warehousing. As such, the proposed hotel will not interfere with the provision of public services or increase the demand for such services. The proposed project would not directly generate an increase in population from the previous use and therefore, would not require the addition or any substantial alteration of fire department or police department infrastructure and impacts would be **less than significant**. Furthermore, there would be no increase in students that would warrant the construction of new schools, parks, or other public facilities. (4-Burbank Land Use Element)

15. Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
RECREATION – Would the project:				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. Implementation of the proposed Project will not increase demand for local or regional parks or other recreational facilities in the area, since the project does not include residential uses, which generate permanent residents and an ongoing demand for recreational resources. The proposed hotel is used as

temporary stay for customers that do not include any operational connection to local or regional parks. There will be on-site amenities for hotel guest only including a pool and fitness center. Therefore, there are minimal impacts to these facilities from visitors to the site and would be considered **less than significant.** No further analysis is needed.

b. The proposed Project does not include recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there will be **no impact**. No further analysis is needed.

16. Transportation and Traffic

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a. The proposed Project site is bounded by South San Fernando Boulevard (Secondary Arterial) to the east, Santa Anita Avenue to the north, and Providencia Avenue to the south. It is in close proximity to the interstate 5 Freeway. The primary vehicular access to the proposed hotel will be from Providencia Avenue and Santa Anita Avenue. Implementation of the proposed project will result in additional vehicle trips, however, based on the City's level of service thresholds, the project will result in a nominal increase in vehicle trips as shown in the trip generation parking analysis. According to the analysis, the project will generate 34 trips during the peak hour. Per the Burbank Municipal Code, projects that generate less than the 50 trips during the peak hour do not require further analysis. The traffic impacts related to the project will therefore be **less than significant**.

b. Both the interstate 5 Freeway and State Route 134 are part of the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) network, although there is only one CMP study segment located within the City's planning area, at I-5 and Burbank Boulevard. The CMP is a state-mandated program administered by the Los Angeles County

Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) that provides a mechanism for coordinating land use and development decisions. CMP statute requires establishment of LOS standards to measure congestion on the system. Level of service ranges from LOS A to F, with LOS A representing free-flow conditions and LOS F representing a High level of congestion.

Highways and roadways designated in the CMP network are required to operate at LOS E, except where base year LOS is worse than LOS E. In such cases, the base year LOS is the standard (Metro 2004:18). In accordance with the CMP guidelines, freeway (mainline) operating conditions during peak periods were evaluated using the general procedures established by the CMP. The freeway mainline location of I-5 at Burbank Boulevard, CMP station number 1006, was analyzed as part of the Burbank2035 EIR and concluded that this CMP freeway segment operates at acceptable LOS (LOS E or better) during the AM and PM peak hours. Furthermore, the subject property would only result in a maximum of 34 net new peak hour trips with the proposed use (Appendix C). Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant.**

c. Air traffic movement will not be directly affected by the proposed Project due to the absence of such facilities within the Project site. Therefore, there will be **no impact** to the air traffic movement.

d. Design of the proposed project does not include any roadway improvements that incorporate hazardous design features, such as sharp curves or dangerous intersections that may affect public safety.

   All street access will be designed and constructed at grade, and will provide adequate sight distance and traffic control measures to allow smooth traffic flow on site and reduce potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**

e. The new driveway access improvements will be constructed to City standards and will not negatively affect emergency access to the Project site or any adjacent land uses. Furthermore there will be no change to the surrounding streets.

   If temporary street or lane closures occur during construction, such closures will be coordinated with the City Traffic Department, as well as the City Fire and Police Departments to assure that emergency access for any impacted land uses is maintained. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**.

f. The City of Burbank includes a comprehensive public transportation system, with local shuttle services, regional bus routes, and commuter rail. Burbank Bus is the local transit service, providing weekday and peak-hour service connecting the Downtown Burbank Metrolink Station to major destinations, including the Media District, Downtown Burbank, the North Hollywood Metro Rail Station, and the Golden State Area.

   The proposed Project provides a widened continuous pedestrian sidewalk on all sidewalks fronting the subject property, which includes South San Fernando Boulevard, Santa Anita Avenue and Providencia Avenue. Further, bike parking will be provided in accordance with current requirements. The project does not conflict but rather supports adopted policies and programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, there would be **no impact**.

17. Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a,b,e. Wastewater flows would be treated by the Burbank Water Reclamation Plant (BWRP). Currently, the average daily wastewater flow is approximately 8.20 MGD; the capacity of the BWRP system is 12.50 MGD. The average daily flow has decreased in recent years due to water conservation measures implemented by the City, residents, and businesses. Additionally, an increase in the use of recycled water for landscaping irrigation in recent years has resulted in less water flowing into the wastewater treatment system. Table 12 shows the estimated wastewater generation of the proposed project based on the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County waste water generation factors.

Table 12
Estimated Wastewater Generation

Land Use	Rooms	Wastewater Generation Factor	Wastewater (GPD)
Hotel	170	125 GPD/room	21,250
		Total Wastewater Generation	**21,250**

GPD = gallons per day
Wastewater generation factors were provided by the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

As shown in Table 12, the proposed project would generate an estimated 21,250 gallons per day (GPD) of wastewater. This accounts for approximately 0.5% of the plant's surplus capacity and would not require expansion of the plant or infrastructure improvements. Thus, impacts would be **less than significant**.

The Los Angeles RWQCB protects ground and surface water quality in the Los Angeles region, including the coastal watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, along with very small portions of Kern and Santa Barbara Counties.

The proposed Project will change the existing land uses on site from retail, warehouse, and auto-related uses to a hotel use. The proposed hotel will generate typical municipal wastewater that can be treated by the BWRP, so applicable treatment requirements will not be exceeded. Thus, impacts would be **less than significant**.

c. The project site is currently covered with impervious surfaces. As discussed in Section VIII, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the proposed project would incrementally decrease stormwater flow by decreasing the amount of impervious surfaces through the introduction of perimeter landscaping and several planters throughout the site. Furthermore, it is expected that the implementation of mandatory BMPs pursuant to SQMP, the Los Angeles County Stormwater Ordinance and the SUSMP, would improve the onsite drainage pattern over existing onsite conditions. Therefore, the flow rate or volume of storm water runoff would not be adversely affected and the construction of new storm water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities would not be warranted. **No impact** would occur.

d. The City of Burbank is a member agency of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). The MWD supplies the City of Burbank with 58% of its water needs, while the other 42% comes from local sources (reservoirs, groundwater, etc.) (MWD, 2007). The City of Burbank predicts it will have sufficient future supply with the implementation of Burbank's Granulated Activated Carbon (GAC) Treatment Plant, which removes volatile organic chemicals from two water wells and will provide 10% of Burbank's annual water requirement, as well as the Groundwater Recovery Plant (GRP), which will provide 60% of Burbank's annual water requirement (MWD, 2005).

In the City of Burbank, water is supplied by the Burbank Water and Power (BWP) Water Division, which provides potable water, water for fire protection purposes, and recycled water to more than 26,000 service connections within the City. BWP received 44 percent of its potable water from Metropolitan supplies during the 2010 calendar year. Burbank has five potable water connections to the Metropolitan system, with a maximum rated capacity of 115 cubic feet per second (51,610 gallons per minute). BWP's water supplies are supplemented locally from groundwater wells drawing from the San Fernando Groundwater Basin, which accounts for the remaining 56 percent of the City's water supply. In 2010, BWP used approximately 7,852 acre-feet of treated water from Metropolitan and supplemented its potable supply with an additional 9,917 acre-feet from groundwater supplies. In addition, BWP is required to purchase additional untreated water supplies from Metropolitan to replenish local groundwater supplies. Recently the City completed a new Metropolitan connection to deliver untreated imported water to the existing Pacoima and Lopez spreading grounds in the north San Fernando Valley for groundwater replenishment. In 2010, the City purchased 2,034 acre-feet. Approximately 73 percent of the City's water is used by residential customers, 20 percent by commercial customers, and the remainder by industrial and other users.

Although localized areas exist where groundwater levels have risen or remained relatively constant, in general groundwater storage in the San Fernando Basin has been steadily declining since the early 1980s because of heavy pumping, limited artificial recharge, and low precipitation. The San Fernando Basin is estimated to have approximately 3.2 million acre-feet of total groundwater storage capacity. The native safe yield, defined as the portion of safe yield derived from native waters, is 43,660 afy. The safe yield, which additionally includes return flows from imported waters, is 90,680 afy. The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) derived a regulatory storage requirement of 360,000 acre-feet for the San Fernando Basin, spanning the interval of 210,000 acre-feet above and 150,000 acre-feet below the amount of water in storage in 1954 (2.99 million acre-feet). Despite the heavy rains of the 2004–2005 water year, the storage volume at the end of water year 2004–2005 was about 113,000 acre-feet below the lowest level of the regulatory storage requirement.

Burbank's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) was prepared as a result of the California Urban Water Management Planning Act. Pursuant to these regulatory requirements, the UWMP includes evaluations of expected water supplies and demands and of the reliability of the supplies and descriptions of water conservation and water management activities, including water recycling and preparation for water shortages. These supply and demand projections are summarized in Table 5.12-1, City of Burbank Water Supply and Demand. The UWMP concluded that the City would not be short any critical water during the 25-year planning period through 2030.

Table 5.12-1
City of Burbank Water Supply and Demand (afy)

Source	2015	2020	2025	2030	2035
Potable					
Purchased from Metropolitan	6,750	7,481	8,141	8,779	9,391
Supplier-produced Groundwater	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Potable Total	17,750	18,431	19,141	19,779	20,391
Non-potable					
Metropolitan Replacement	2,100	500	300	200	100
Recycled Water	3,660	5,160	5,160	5,160	5,160
Non-potable Total	5,760	5,660	5,460	5,360	5,260
Total Supplies	23,510	24,141	24,601	25,139	25,651
Total Demand	23,511	24,141	24,601	25,139	N/A
Difference (supply minus demand)	-1	0	0	0	N/A

Source: City of Burbank, 2011.
Notes: afy = acre-feet per year; BWP = Burbank Water and Power.

The proposed hotel's average water use is 46,725 gallons per occupied room per year (American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Commercial and Institutional End Uses of Water, 2000, Table ES-3). With the hotel's 170 rooms, the average water usage for the hotel, if fully occupied, would be 7,943,250 gallons/year or 21,762 gallons/day. This usage amount equates to 24.38 acre feet per year. The City used 17,591 acre feet in 2010. This project represents .1% of the annual water demand and the impacts related to water supplies would be **less than significant**.

f,g. Solid waste generated by the proposed project would be taken to the Burbank Landfill Site No. 3, which is owned and operated by the City of Burbank and regulated by the Los Angeles County Department of Health Services, the Los Angeles RWQCB and, the South Coast AQMD. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), the landfill has a permitted maximum of 240 tons of solid waste per day, with an estimated annual capacity of 61,440 tons (based on 256 permitted days of operation per year). Table 13 shows the estimated solid waste that would be generated by the proposed project.

The proposed project would contribute approximately 62 tons of solid waste per year, or approximately 340 pounds of solid waste per day. This represents approximately 0.10% of Burbank Landfill Site No. 3's permitted annual capacity, and impacts related to solid waste would be **less than significant**.

Table 13
Estimated Solid Waste Generation

Land Use	Rooms	Solid Waste Generation Factor	Solid Waste (ton/year)
Hotel	170 rooms	2 lb/room/day	62 tons
		Total Solid Waste Generation	62 tons

Solid Waste generation factors were taken based on rates provided on the California Integrated Waste Management Board Website (http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/WasteChar/WasteGenRates/default.htm)

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Project Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Discussion

a. As discussed in Section VI, *Biological Resources*, the proposed project would not adversely affect any fish or wildlife species, as the project site has been previously developed and is located in a highly urbanized area. As discussed in Section V, *Cultural Resources*, the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect unknown cultural resources and impacts would be **potentially significant**. However, significant impacts associated with the disturbance of unknown cultural resources would be reduced to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 and CR-2.

b. Emissions for both long-term operation of the proposed project and temporary construction activities were lower than SCAQMD significance thresholds without mitigation. Please refer to Section III, *Air Quality,* for further discussion of this issue. As discussed in Section XV, *Stormwater,* mandatory compliance with existing federal and state policies and City ordinances, which require that long-term operation BMPs be implemented, would reduce water quality impacts to the maximum extent practicable. The project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant** with respect to this issue.

c. The project site is within an area designated as potentially at risk of liquefaction. However, a site-specific liquefaction analysis included in Appendix B, indicates that the site soils would not be prone to liquefaction during the ground motion expected during the design basis earthquake. Please refer to Section VI, *Geology and Soils,* for further discussion of the issue. As discussed in Section III, *Air Quality*, emissions generated by construction and operation of the project would be below SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. No substantial adverse effects on human beings would be caused by direct or indirect environmental effects resulting from the project.

However, as discussed in Section XII, Noise, the proposed project has the potential for noise impacts that could be potentially significant. However, mitigation measures would be applied to reduce impacts related to vibration and noise associated with construction to a less than significant level with the incorporation of Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-15. Therefore, impacts would be **less than significant with project mitigation.**

REFERENCES

AEI Consultants Environmental & Engineering Services, "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment", November 2012.

AEI Consultants Environmental & Engineering Services, "Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment", February 2013.

American Water Works Association Research Foundation, Commercial and Institutional End User of Water, 2000 Table ES-3

California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2011.1.1 computer program Developed by ENVIRON International Corporation in collaboration with SCAQMD and other California Air Districts

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land resource Protection, Farmland mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County important Farmland Map 2010.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Studies Zones, Burbank Quadrangle, 1979.

California Seismic Safety Commission, Homeowner's Guide to Earthquake Safety, 2005 Edition.

City of Burbank, Burbank Center Plan, 1997.

City of Burbank, "Burbank Municipal Code"

City of Burbank, General Plan Land Use Element, 1988.

City of Burbank, General Plan Safety Element, 1997.

City of Burbank, Trip Generation for Proposed Development, November 2012.

City of Burbank "Zoning Map," Burbank, California

County of Los Angeles, Fire Department, Health Hazardous Materials Division website,

http://www.fire.lacounty.gov/HealthHazMat/CUPAJurisdictions.asp, accessed April 23, 2008.

Geotechnologies, Inc., "Geotechnical Engineering investigation-Proposed Hotel", December 18, 2012.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, http://www.mwdh2o.com/, accessed online April 2008.

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.

Southern California Association of Governments, 2008 Regional Transportation Plan, May 2008

State of California, Department of transportation (Caltrans), California Scenic Highway System,

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm, accessed online April 2008.

State of California, Air Resources Board, http://www.arb.ca.gov, accessed online April 2008

State of California, Department of Conservation Seismic Hazards Zonation Program,

http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/shzp/PagesIndex.aspx, accessed online April 30, 2008.

State of California, Seismic Hazards Zones, Burbank Quadrangle Map Official Map, March 25, 1999.

U.S. Geological Survey, National Seismic Hazard Map, Fact Sheet, 2008.